

REMARKS

Claims 1-75 are pending in the present application.

Reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

The claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth herein. Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchino (USP 5,055,681) in view of Hintz et al. (EP 0,574,020).

Tsuchino is cited as disclosing a method for forming a radiographic image storage panel. As stated by the Office, the method disclosed by Tsuchino involves employing various phosphors in the image storage panel, vacuum evaporation, sputtering, chemical vapor deposition, spraying and baking. The Office correctly notes that Tsuchino fails to recite two cylindrical carrier rollers as claimed. Hintz is cited as disclosing a system comprising carrier rollers which guide the substrate through the coating system.

Applicants respectfully submit that additional claimed features are neither considered by the Office nor addressed in Tsuchino or Hintz. The claimed invention includes coating a phosphor or scintillator layer within a sealed zone. Neither Tsuchino nor Hintz suggest a sealed zone nor do they provide any guidance by which one may consider the necessity, or even desire, for a sealed zone. As a further delineation from the cited art the instantly claimed invention recites a laminating unit within the sealed zone. Neither Tsuchino nor Hintz recite, or even contemplate, a laminator and they certainly do not recite a laminator within a zone since the zone is not considered.

Tsuchino taken in view of Hintz fails to recite, at least, a sealed zone and a laminator within the sealed zone as recited in claim 1. Claim 2 further includes a delaminator within the sealed zone.

Claims 3-75 each ultimately depend from claim 1 and many of these claims include the further limitation of claim 2. Claims 3-75 therefore recite a laminator within the zone and many of these claims further recite a delaminator within the zone. Tsuchino and Hintz therefore fail to recite critical elements of

the claim and lack any guidance leading one of skill in the art towards these elements.


Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-75 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchino (USP 5,055,681) in view of Hintz et al. (EP 0,574,020) is improper due to the failure of the reference to recite, or lead one of skill in the art towards, at least a sealed zone for the application of the coated material and a laminator within the sealed zone. The rejection is even more improper for claim 2 and claims dependent thereon wherein a delaminator is recited within the zone.

For, at least, these reasons Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-75 be withdrawn and earnestly solicit a notice of allowance therefore.

CONCLUSIONS

All pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph T. Guy, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Registration Number 35,172
Customer No.: 46591

April 8, 2006